

## REMARKS

This is in response to the October 14, 2005 final office action rejection of claims 1 and 9. Claims 2-5, 8, 10 and 21-25 are allowed.

Claim 9 is rejected as anticipated by Burnham (U.S. Patent No. 2,555,113). Claim 9 has been cancelled.

Claim 1 is rejected as obvious over Burnham. The office action at page it is acknowledged that Burnham does not disclose a front leg that is wider than it is deep. The office action goes on to state that

[i]t would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the shape of the front leg to have a greater width than depth. The fact that the width of the leg is greater than the depth of the leg does not appear to solve any stated problem and it appears as if a leg with a greater depth than width would function equally as well.


One advantage is that a wider front leg provides for greater stability from side to side. Another advantage is as shown in Fig. 4, when the chair is in the folded position the thinner leg depth provides the ability to store the chair in a more compact space, e.g., more chairs can be stacked in a smaller space. This is possible without loss of leg strength which is provided by the wider width. Other advantages are apparent.

For at least these reasons, Burnham does not teach or suggest a width of the leg that is greater than the depth of the leg as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, all of the claims (Nos. 1-5, 8, 10 and 21-25) are in allowable form and allowance of the application is, respectfully, requested.

It is respectfully requested that, if necessary to effect a timely response, this paper be considered as a Petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response and shortages in other fees, be charged, or any overpayment in fees be credited, to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg, Deposit Account No. 02-1010 (20341-73107).

Respectfully submitted,  
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP



Richard B. Lazarus  
Reg. No. 48,215  
(202) 289-1313